

Mary Lou Terrien

From: Carol Edmunds <Edmunds@msu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2016 11:08 PM
To: Mary Lou Terrien
Subject: HB 5041

This bill is the epitome of bad government. Rep. Chatfield introduced this bill at the behest of a personal friend. It is a bill designed to benefit a small group of landlords in East Lansing which includes his friend's family. This is absolutely unconscionable. The general population of East Lansing does not support this bill.

The landlords of East Lansing have been given ample time to speak to your committee. Many citizens of East Lansing have come to the hearings to speak against the bill and have never been given a chance to speak. I spoke face to face with Rep. Chatfield after a hearing and complained that I was not given the chance to speak. He assured me he would let me speak at the next hearing. I went to that hearing and I filled out a card and once again I was not given a chance to speak. I can only assume that Rep Chatfield does not care about what I have to say and/or he does not want the rest of the committee to hear someone speak against his bill and his personal friends.

The landlords of East Lansing have misled you when they have spoken before the committee. They will tell you that they are not allowed to make improvements to their properties and this is not true. They can make many improvements to the properties, they just cannot change the footprint of a house--for example chop a normal sized bedroom into two cell-like bedrooms.

The landlords will tell you that they are doing this all for the comfort and convenience of their student renters. These landlords have no problem renting the houses as they now exist--in fact by the first week of October 2015 the houses were all rented for the school year beginning August 2016.

The fact that they can have leases signed ten months ahead of the move-in date says that they have a market where they can pretty much name their price. Any money the landlords invest in the so called "improvements" that they want to make will be returned to them in the form of higher rents. To believe otherwise would be naive.

Rep. Chatfield agreed to let the landlords and the city of East Lansing try to come to a solution that will be acceptable to permanent residents of the neighborhoods and the landlords. There have been ongoing meetings to work out such a solution--so why the hurry to suddenly have a vote on this bill?

Has Rep. Chatfield's personal friend urged him to move on the bill?

I find it offensive that this bill is written in such a way that it pretty much only applies to a small group of landlords in one city and will not apply anywhere else in the state. This bill is the poster child for cronyism at its worst.

Thank you

Carolyn Edmunds